



Year: 2019

In-hospital cost analysis of prostatic artery embolization compared to transurethral resection of the prostate: Post hoc analysis of a randomized controlled trial

Müllhaupt, Gautier ; Hechelhammer, Lukas ; Engeler, Daniel S ; Güsewell, Sabine ; Betschart, Patrick ; Zumstein, Valentin ; Kessler, Thomas M ; Schmid, Hans-Peter ; Mordasini, Livio ; Abt, Dominik

Abstract: **OBJECTIVES** To perform a post-hoc analysis of in-hospital costs incurred in a randomized controlled trial comparing prostatic artery embolization (PAE) and transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP). **PATIENTS AND METHODS** In-hospital costs arising from PAE and TURP were calculated using detailed expenditure reports provided by the hospital accounts department. Total costs including those arising from surgical and interventional procedures, consumables, personnel, and accommodation were analysed for all of the study participants and compared between PAE and TURP using descriptive analysis and two-sided t-tests adjusted for unequal variance within groups (Welch t-test). **RESULTS** Mean total costs per patient (\pm SD) were higher for TURP at €9,137 \pm 3,301 than for PAE at €8,185 \pm 1,630. The mean difference (md) of €952 was not statistically significant ($p=0.07$). While the mean procedural costs were significantly higher for PAE (md €623 ($p=0.009$)), costs apart from the procedure were significantly lower for PAE with an md of €1,627 ($p<0.001$). Procedural costs of €1,433 \pm 552 for TURP were mainly incurred by anaesthesia, whereas €2,590 \pm 628 for medical supplies were the main cost factor for PAE. **CONCLUSIONS** Since in-hospital costs are similar but PAE and TURP have different efficacy and safety profiles, the patient's clinical condition and expectations - rather than finances - should be taken into account when deciding between PAE and TURP. This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.14660>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-160669>

Journal Article

Accepted Version

Originally published at:

Müllhaupt, Gautier; Hechelhammer, Lukas; Engeler, Daniel S; Güsewell, Sabine; Betschart, Patrick; Zumstein, Valentin; Kessler, Thomas M; Schmid, Hans-Peter; Mordasini, Livio; Abt, Dominik (2019). In-hospital cost analysis of prostatic artery embolization compared to transurethral resection of the prostate: Post hoc analysis of a randomized controlled trial. *BJU International*, 123(6):1055-1060.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.14660>

DR. GAUTIER MÜLLHAUPT (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-5725-5608)
DR. PATRICK BETSCHART (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-8496-9470)
DR. VALENTIN ZUMSTEIN (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-7881-9134)
PROF. THOMAS M KESSLER (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-1991-5919)
DR. LIVIO MORDASINI (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-4087-6555)
DR. DOMINIK ABT (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-1915-4726)

Article type : Original Article

Article Category: Functional Urology

In-hospital cost analysis of prostatic artery embolization compared to transurethral resection of the prostate: Post hoc analysis of a randomized controlled trial.

Gautier Müllhaupt¹, Lukas Hechelhammer², Daniel. S. Engeler¹, Sabine Güsewell³, Patrick Betschart¹, Valentin Zumstein¹, Thomas M. Kessler⁴, Hans-Peter Schmid¹, Livio Mordasini¹, Dominik Abt¹

¹ Department of Urology, St. Gallen Cantonal Hospital, St Gallen, Switzerland

² Department of Radiology and Nuclear Medicine, St. Gallen Cantonal Hospital, St. Gallen, Switzerland

³ Clinical Trials Unit, St. Gallen Cantonal Hospital, St. Gallen, Switzerland

⁴ Department of Neuro-Urology, Balgrist University Hospital, University of Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/bju.14660

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Corresponding author:

Dr. med. Gautier Müllhaupt, Kantonsspital St. Gallen, Klinik für Urologie,
Rorschacherstrasse 95, 9007 St. Gallen, T +41 71 494 14 24, gautier.muellhaupt@kssg.ch

E-mail addresses of co-authors:

lukas.hechelhammer@kssg.ch, patrick.betschart@kssg.ch, valentin.zumstein@gmail.com,
sabine.guesewell@kssg.ch, tkessler@gmx.ch, daniel.engeler@kssg.ch, hans-
peter.schmid@kssg.ch, livio.mordasini@icloud.com, dominik.abt@kssg.ch

Abstract

Objectives

To perform a post-hoc analysis of in-hospital costs incurred in a randomized controlled trial comparing prostatic artery embolization (PAE) and transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP).

Patients and Methods

In-hospital costs arising from PAE and TURP were calculated using detailed expenditure reports provided by the hospital accounts department. Total costs including those arising from surgical and interventional procedures, consumables, personnel, and accommodation were analysed for all of the study participants and compared between PAE and TURP using descriptive analysis and two-sided t-tests adjusted for unequal variance within groups (Welch t-test).

Results

Mean total costs per patient (\pm SD) were higher for TURP at €9,137 \pm 3,301 than for PAE at €8,185 \pm 1,630. The mean difference (md) of €952 was not statistically significant ($p=0.07$).

While the mean procedural costs were significantly higher for PAE (md €623 ($p=0.009$)), costs apart from the procedure were significantly lower for PAE with an md of €1,627 ($p<0.001$). Procedural costs of €1,433 \pm 552 for TURP were mainly incurred by anaesthesia, whereas €2,590 \pm 628 for medical supplies were the main cost factor for PAE.

Conclusions

Since in-hospital costs are similar but PAE and TURP have different efficacy and safety profiles, the patient's clinical condition and expectations – rather than finances – should be taken into account when deciding between PAE and TURP.

Key words: Prostatic artery embolization; transurethral resection of the prostate; benign prostatic hyperplasia; prostate; obstruction; costs;

Introduction

Benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) affects about 50% of men aged 50–60 years and about 90% of men aged 85 years or older [1]. Treatment costs of lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to BPH (BPH-LUTS) are a substantial economic burden that will increase in the future due to demographic changes. Thus, the estimated annual treatment costs were US\$ 4 billion in the United States in 2006, and €858 per patient in Europe in 2003 [2, 3].

Transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) is still the gold standard for most patients if conservative and medical treatment fail [4]. Although it is performed in more than 100,000 men annually in the USA [5], it is associated with a high morbidity [6, 7], 40% of patients have residual LUTS requiring drug treatment within 5 years after surgery [8], and an endourological reintervention rate of 12.3% at 8 years has been reported [9]. These drawbacks have led to a continuous search for less invasive alternative treatment options.

Prostatic artery embolization (PAE) is a minimally invasive endovascular procedure performed under local anaesthesia and was shown to improve BPH-LUTS for the first time in

2000 [10]. The improvement in BPH-LUTS after PAE is similar to that achieved by TURP and is associated with fewer adverse events [11-14]. PAE was therefore recently recommended as a minimally invasive treatment alternative for BPH-LUTS by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) [15]. Desobstructive efficacy with PAE is, however, inferior to that associated with TURP [13], and no long-term findings have so far been published. Although recent urological guidelines still do not yet recommend PAE outside controlled studies [4, 16], it is increasingly being performed worldwide.

Considering the high economic burden of BPH-LUTS treatment and the substantial differences between technical aspects of PAE and established transurethral surgical treatments, cost analyses in this field seem to be of particular interest. Only one cost analysis is available for PAE so far: Bagla et al. [17] retrospectively compared costs of patients undergoing PAE or TURP in a hospital setting in the USA, and found statistically significantly lower costs for PAE.

Treatment costs strongly depend on the performance setting and may also vary between different health care systems, regions, and institutions. The aim of this study, therefore, was to analyse costs that occurred in a randomized controlled trial comparing the efficacy and safety of PAE and TURP in Switzerland [13].

Patients and Methods

Study design

Data were derived from an unblinded, single-centre, randomized, controlled trial [13]. The study including the present post-hoc analysis was approved by the local ethics committee (EKSG14/004) and funded by a grant from the hospital's research committee (14/08). Study coordination, data management, and data and safety monitoring were performed by independent experts from the hospital's Clinical Trials Unit (CTU). The trial was performed according to the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki [18] and the Guidelines

for Good Clinical Practice [19] and was registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT02054013). The CTU trial statistician (S.G.) performed the data analyses.

Participants

Inclusion criteria were: (I) men older than 40 years, (II) TURP indicated, (III) patient refractory to medical therapy or not willing to undergo or continue medical treatment, (IV) prostate size of 25–80 mL measured by transabdominal ultrasound, (V) International Prostate Symptoms Score (IPSS) ≥ 8 , (VI) IPSS quality of life (IPSS-QoL) ≥ 3 , (VII) Qmax < 12 mL/s and/or urinary retention, and (VIII) written informed consent [13].

Exclusion criteria were: (I) severe atherosclerosis, aneurysmatic changes or severe tortuosity in the aortic bifurcation or internal iliac arteries, (II) acontractile detrusor, (III) neurogenic lower urinary tract dysfunction, (IV) urethral stenosis, (V) bladder diverticulum, (VI) bladder stone, (VII) allergy to intravenous contrast media, (VIII) contraindication for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), (IX) pre-interventionally proven carcinoma of the prostate, and (X) renal failure (GFR < 60 mL/min) [13].

Interventions

PAE was performed by one experienced interventional radiologist familiar with the procedure according to established techniques [12, 20]. After insertion of a 16 F transurethral catheter, a unilateral femoral sheath was placed in the right common femoral artery under local anaesthesia. Prostatic arterial supply was identified by selective internal iliac arteriography with a 5 F angiocatheter (Merit Medical Inc., South Jordan, UT, USA). Catheterization of prostatic arteries was performed with 1.9–2.4 F microcatheters (Parkway soft; Asahi Intecc, Nagoya, JP; Progreat; Terumo, Tokyo, JP; Direxion; Boston Scientific, Natick, MA, USA). Embosphere[®] microspheres (Boston Scientific) were used for embolization. 400 μ m microspheres were used in patients with visible arterial collaterals to extraprostatic territories and without the possibility of occlusion with microcoils. All other patients were embolised using 250 μ m particles. The microspheres, which are delivered in 20 mL syringes containing

2 mL of microspheres and 5 mL of NaCl, were diluted with 2.5 or 3 mL of Visipaque 320 (GE Healthcare, Little Chalfont, UK) according to the IFU of the manufacturer. Cone beam CT was applied only in difficult cases to identify prostatic arteries or prevent off-target embolization [21]. PAE was performed bilaterally if possible. Successful embolization was defined as absence of the normal blush of the prostate and complete stasis of flow in the prostatic arteries on post embolization angiography. The transurethral catheter was removed on the morning after the intervention in patients without indwelling catheter before hospitalization. All patients received perioperative antibiotic prophylaxis for 24 hours (ciprofloxacin 500mg twice daily).

Monopolar TURP was performed under spinal or general anaesthesia by four board certified study physicians using a 24 F resectoscope (Karl Storz Endoskope, Binningen, Switzerland) with a standard tungsten wire loop (Karl Storz Endoskope, Binningen, Switzerland) and electrolyte-free mannitol-sorbitol solution (Purisol, Fresenius Kabi AG, Bad Homburg, Germany). A 20 F three way catheter was inserted for irrigation after resection, and left for at least two days depending on postoperative hematuria. Patients received perioperative antibiotic prophylaxis (ciprofloxacin 500 mg twice daily), which was discontinued after removal of the bladder catheter or after three days at the latest.

According to the study protocol, the earliest patient discharge after both procedures was to be on the second postoperative day.

Financial data

Detailed expense reports based on work records of activities and services performed by the medical and nursing staff, medical consumables used, medications administered, and costs for accommodation, rooms, and equipment were provided by the accounts department of the hospital for each of the study participants. These were used to compare in-hospital costs arising from PAE and TURP. The calculations of the costs of the interventional and surgical

facilities (i.e. technical staff, premises, and equipment) were based on average personnel costs per minute, fixed charges for room costs, and proportionate depreciation of equipment. For PAE, the costs for operation facilities also included the costs of the imaging studies (e.g. angiography, cone beam CT) because they could not be filtered out separately. Fixed charges were also applied for the calculation of administrative costs.

Costs were divided into procedural costs and costs arising from the hospital stay.

Procedural costs for TURP included professional charges of the urologist, costs of operation facilities (i.e. technical staff, premises, and equipment), medical supplies required for TURP (e.g. resection loop, irrigation solution, tissue evacuation system), costs for anaesthesia (i.e. anaesthesiology staff and medical supplies, recovery room) and histological tissue examination.

Procedural costs of PAE included professional charges of the interventional radiologist, costs of operation facilities (i.e. technical staff, premises, equipment and imaging studies) and medical supplies required for PAE (e.g. local anaesthesia, access sheath, microcatheters, guidewires, microspheres).

Costs of the inpatient stay in both groups included physician's professional charges, services by nursing specialists, medical supplies (e.g. irrigation solutions, wound care), medication, laboratory services, administration and accommodation (i.e. premises, housekeeping, and catering). The latter was based on fixed sums calculated by the accounts department.

Expense reports were provided in Swiss francs (CHF) and converted to euros (€) as a more widely used currency based on the average exchange rate over the study recruitment period from 2014 to 2017 of €1=1.12 Swiss francs.

Statistics

Cost breakdowns were summarized by means and standard deviations. Differences between PAE and TURP were tested using two-sided t-tests adjusted for unequal variance within groups (Welch t-test). P-values for recovery variables were also calculated using two-sided t-tests and those for adverse events using Fisher's exact test.

Results

A total of 103 patients were randomly assigned to PAE or TURP between February 2014 and May 2017. Of these, 48 patients underwent PAE and 51 TURP. The data for one patient who underwent PAE could not be provided by the accounts department due to incorrect allocation by the software. The patient's hospital stay was uneventful. Baseline characteristics of the study patients and details of how PAE and TURP were performed are reported in detail elsewhere [13] and are summarized in Table 1.

Costs for PAE and TURP are categorized in Table 2 and illustrated in Figure 1. Mean total costs per patient were lower for PAE (€8,185 SD \pm 1,630) compared to TURP (€9,137 \pm 3,301). However, the mean difference (md) of €952 was not significant ($p=0.07$).

Mean costs for the surgical procedure alone were €4,240 \pm 774 for PAE and €3,617 \pm 1,429 for TURP (md €623, $p = 0.009$). While the main cost factor for the surgical procedure was anaesthesia (mean costs €1,433 \pm 552) for TURP, medical supplies were the major costs for PAE (mean costs €2,590 \pm 628).

Mean costs of the inpatient stay were €3,837 \pm 1,179 for PAE and €5,405 \pm 2280 for TURP (md €1,627, $p= <0.001$). Services provided by the nursing staff were one of the main cost factors for the hospital stay for both PAE (€1,265 \pm 369) and TURP (€2,143 \pm 884).

Discussion

This post-hoc analysis shows that total in-hospital costs tend to be higher for TURP than for PAE. The difference between mean total costs was, however, small at 10.4% and not statistically significant.

Separate analysis of the costs of the surgical procedure and inpatient costs shows that the costs of surgery are statistically significantly higher for PAE, while those for the inpatient stay are statistically significantly higher for TURP. Substantial differences were found when the costs for the surgical procedure were analysed in more detail. Clear savings were found for PAE, as no general or spinal anaesthesia and no recovery room were required. In contrast, the procedural costs for PAE were high, especially for medical supplies, the use of expensive imaging studies, and a longer intervention time.

Statistically significantly higher inpatient costs were found for TURP. As TURP is clearly more invasive than PAE, a higher degree of postoperative care, including nursing and physician services, seem to be plausible. Moreover, patients had a statistically significantly longer hospital stay after TURP.

The randomized study design is the main strength of this study. As PAE and TURP have a clearly different safety and efficacy profile, selection bias would have been likely to occur in a non-randomized study setting. All financial data used in this analysis were routinely and independently assessed by the hospital accounts department.

However, this study was performed as a post-hoc analysis and therefore has the typical limitations of such studies. Patient characteristics and technical variations in PAE and TURP were limited due to clear definitions by the study protocol. To assess potential complications, the study protocol also defined the minimum hospital stay after surgery, which is an important cost factor. PAE can also be performed in an outpatient setting leaving room for

considerably lower costs than inpatient treatment. However, considering the frequent occurrence of pain in the first 24 hours after PAE [13], also reflected by the more frequent use of analgesics in PAE patients in this study, a short term hospital stay seems to be justified. In addition, the duration of hospitalization can also be reduced after TURP, as shown elsewhere [22, 23]. PAE was performed by a specific interventional radiologist and TURP by selected surgeons, which may give rise to expert bias.

Some of the costs included, e.g. premises and depreciation of equipment, can only be estimated. The fixed sums used for the calculations are based on standard calculations used by the hospital accounts department. Costs that arose from in-hospital complications (Tab. 1) could not be filtered out separately by the accounts department of the hospital and, therefore, were not available for our analysis. As healthcare systems vary widely between different countries, our results will not be generalizable to countries with clearly different health care structures.

So far, only one comparative cost analysis has been made available for PAE. Although Bagla et al. [17] performed a non-randomized comparison of in-hospital costs for PAE and TURP, with statistically significantly different baseline characteristics between the two groups, most of their results were in line with our findings. Thus, the authors report on lower total costs, and a shorter duration of hospitalization, but higher costs for the intraprocedural supplies for PAE. Differences from our study regarding the total amounts might mainly be caused by a different assessment and classification of costs, different materials used for surgery, and shorter hospitalization times.

Our study focused on in-hospital costs. Postoperative incapacity for work, management of post-hospitalization adverse events, and re-interventions and medical treatment for BPH-LUTS during long-term follow-up would have to be included to estimate the actual economic burden for the healthcare system. Such data are not available yet but will be assessed during the long-term follow up of the trial. Due to its efficacy and safety profile, PAE has

been suggested as an appropriate alternative to medical treatment [13, 24]. In Switzerland, costs of €202.05 and €456.25 per year arise from prescription of the cheapest alpha-blocker and a combined alpha-blocker and 5-alpha-reductase inhibitor [25]. Considering mean total and surgical procedure costs for PAE of €8,185 ± 1,630 and €4,240 ± 774, it seems that not only clinical efficacy but also long term cost effectiveness of PAE in this setting still has to be demonstrated.

In conclusion, in-hospital costs tend to be higher for TURP than PAE. While consumables are clearly more expensive for PAE, it is associated with cost savings regarding anaesthesia and post-operative expenses. Considering the rather small cost differences and the different efficacy and safety profiles of PAE and TURP, this study clearly suggests that the patient's clinical condition and expectations – rather than treatment costs – are the leading factors in determining whether PAE or TURP is chosen.

Acknowledgements: The Clinical Trials Unit of St. Gallen Cantonal Hospital provided important support with study coordination, data management and trial monitoring. Karin Schneider and Stefan Truniger from the accounts department provided the expense reports and important help with the analyses. Alistair Reeves edited the manuscript.

Funding: The study was funded by a grant of the research committee of the hospital (14/08). There was no commercial support.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Informed consent: Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Ethics Statement: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Abbreviations

BPH	Benign prostatic hyperplasia
BPH-LUTS	Lower urinary tract symptoms secondary to benign prostatic hyperplasia
IPSS	International prostate symptoms score
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
PAE	Prostatic artery embolization
Qmax	Maximum urinary flow rate
TURP	Transurethral resection of the prostate
AE	Adverse event
CTU	Clinical Trial Unit
CHF	Swiss Francs
€	Euro

References

- [1] Berry SJ, Coffey DS, Walsh PC, Ewing LL. The development of human benign prostatic hyperplasia with age. J Urol. 1984 Sep; **132**:474-9
- [2] Taub DA, Wei JT. The economics of benign prostatic hyperplasia and lower urinary tract symptoms in the United States. Curr Urol Rep. 2006 Jul; **7**:272-81
- [3] van Exel NJ, Koopmanschap MA, McDonnell J, et al. Medical consumption and costs during a one-year follow-up of patients with LUTS suggestive of BPH in six european countries: report of the TRIUMPH study. Eur Urol. 2006 Jan; **49**:92-102
- [4] Gravas S CJ, Drake MJ, et al. EAU Guidelines on management of non-neurogenic male lower urinary tract symptoms (LUTS), incl. benign prostatic obstruction (BPO). 2018 <https://uroweb.org/guideline/treatment-of-non-neurogenic-male-luts/>.
- [5] Malaeb BS, Yu X, McBean AM, Elliott SP. National trends in surgical therapy for benign prostatic hyperplasia in the United States (2000-2008). Urology. 2012 May; **79**:1111-6

- [6] Reich O, Gratzke C, Bachmann A, et al. Morbidity, mortality and early outcome of transurethral resection of the prostate: a prospective multicenter evaluation of 10,654 patients. *J Urol*. 2008 Jul; **180**:246-9
- [7] Ahyai SA, Gilling P, Kaplan SA, et al. Meta-analysis of functional outcomes and complications following transurethral procedures for lower urinary tract symptoms resulting from benign prostatic enlargement. *Eur Urol*. 2010 Sep; **58**:384-97
- [8] Lukacs B, Cornu JN, Aout M, et al. Management of lower urinary tract symptoms related to benign prostatic hyperplasia in real-life practice in france: a comprehensive population study. *Eur Urol*. 2013 Sep; **64**:493-501
- [9] Eredics K, Wachabauer D, Rothlin F, Madersbacher S, Schauer I. Reoperation Rates and Mortality After Transurethral and Open Prostatectomy in a Long-term Nationwide Analysis: Have We Improved Over a Decade? *Urology*. 2018 Aug; **118**:152-7
- [10] DeMeritt JS, Elmasri FF, Esposito MP, Rosenberg GS. Relief of benign prostatic hyperplasia-related bladder outlet obstruction after transarterial polyvinyl alcohol prostate embolization. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2000 Jun; **11**:767-70
- [11] Shim SR, Kanhai KJ, Ko YM, Kim JH. Efficacy and Safety of Prostatic Arterial Embolization: Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis and Meta-Regression. *J Urol*. 2017 Feb; **197**:465-79
- [12] Ray AF, Powell J, Speakman MJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of prostate artery embolization for benign prostatic hyperplasia: an observational study and propensity-matched comparison with transurethral resection of the prostate (the UK-ROPE study). *BJU Int*. 2018 Apr 12:
- [13] Abt D, Hechelhammer L, Mullhaupt G, et al. Comparison of prostatic artery embolisation (PAE) versus transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP) for benign prostatic hyperplasia: randomised, open label, non-inferiority trial. *BMJ*. 2018 Jun 19; **361**:k2338
- [14] Zumstein V, et al. Prostatic Artery Embolization versus Standard Surgical Treatment for Lower Urinary Tract Symptoms Secondary to Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Eur Urol Focus* (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euf.2018.09.005>.
- [15] Mayor S. NICE recommends prostate artery embolisation as a treatment option for BPH symptoms. *BMJ*. 2018 Apr 27; **361**:k1879
- [16] American Urological Association Guideline: Management of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia (BPH) [Internet]. 2010 [cited 25 August 2018]. Available from: [https://www.auanet.org/benign-prostatic-hyperplasia-\(2010-reviewed-and-validity-confirmed-2014\)](https://www.auanet.org/benign-prostatic-hyperplasia-(2010-reviewed-and-validity-confirmed-2014)).
- [17] Bagla S, Smirniotopoulos J, Orlando J, Piechowiak R. Cost Analysis of Prostate Artery Embolization (PAE) and Transurethral Resection of the Prostate (TURP) in the Treatment of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2017 Nov; **40**:1694-7
- [18] World Medical Association. Declaration of Helsinki - ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects [Internet]. 1964 [cited 25 August 2018]. Available from: <https://www.wma.net/en/>.
- [19] International conference on harmonisation: Good clinical practice guideline [Internet]. [cited 25 August 2018]. Available from: <http://www.compendium.ch>. <http://www.ich.org/products/guidelines/efficacy/article/efficacyguidelines>.
- [20] Carnevale FC, Antunes AA. Prostatic artery embolization for enlarged prostates due to benign prostatic hyperplasia. How I do it. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol*. 2013 Dec; **36**:1452-63

- [21] Bagla S, Rholl KS, Sterling KM, et al. Utility of cone-beam CT imaging in prostatic artery embolization. *J Vasc Interv Radiol*. 2013 Nov; **24**:1603-7
- [22] Comat V, Marquette T, Sutter W, et al. Day-Case Holmium Laser Enucleation of the Prostate: Prospective Evaluation of 90 Consecutive Cases. *J Endourol*. 2017 Oct; **31**:1056-61
- [23] Tabatabaei S, Zangi M. Outpatient surgery for lower urinary tract symptoms/benign prostatic hyperplasia: truth or myth? *Curr Opin Urol*. 2015 Jan; **25**:27-31
- [24] Challacombe B, Sabharwal T. Prostate artery embolisation for benign prostatic hyperplasia - PAE fills a therapeutic niche between medication and surgery. *BMJ*. 2018 Jun 19; **361**:k2537
- [25] Swiss drug compendium [Internet]. HCI Solutions AG Switzerland. 2018 [cited 25 August 2018]. Available from: <http://www.compendium.ch>

Table and Figure Legends

Table 1. Baseline characteristics, perioperative data, and recovery parameters of the study patients.

Table 2. Cost breakdown for in-hospital costs arising from PAE and TURP.

Figure 1. Cost summary for PAE and TURP grouped by mean total (A), procedural (B), and inpatient stay (B) costs. (stay: inpatient stay; proc: surgical procedure; suppl: medical supplies; facil: operation facilities; phys: physician professional charges; anaest: anaesthesia; patho: pathology; lab: laboratory services; medic: medication; accom: accommodation; nurs: services by nursing specialists; admin: administrative costs)

Table 1. Baseline characteristics, perioperative data, and recovery parameters of the study patients.

Baseline characteristics (mean \pm SD)	PAE (N = 48)	TURP (N = 51)	P - value
Age (years)	65.7 \pm 9.3	66.1 \pm 9.8	
Body mass index ^a	26.5 \pm 4.2	27.0 \pm 3.9	
Charlson Comorbidity Index	3.6 \pm 1.6	4.3 \pm 2.1	
Prostate specific antigen (PSA) - ng/mL	4.2 \pm 5.4	4.5 \pm 5.6	
Prostate volume (magnetic resonance imaging) - mL	52.8 \pm 32.0	56.5 \pm 31.1	
Perioperative data (N and % or mean \pm SD)			
Anesthesia			
General	-	26 (51%)	
Spinal	-	25 (49%)	
Local	48 (100%)	-	
Procedure time (min)	122.2 \pm 25.8	69.5 \pm 22.5	< 0.001
PAE details (N and % or mean \pm SD)			
Bilateral	36 (75.0%)	-	
Unilateral	12 (25.0%)		
Fluoroscopy time (min)	50.8 \pm 17.5	-	
Radiation dose (Gy/cm ²)	176.5 \pm 101.2	-	
Use of cone beam CT	5 (10.4%)		
Pain during intervention (VAS ^b)	0.1 \pm 0.6	-	
Additional analgesics necessary ^c	2 (4.2%)	-	
Amount of embolization particles used (mL)	1.0 \pm 0.4	-	
TURP details			
Time of resection (min)	-	58.25 \pm 24.33	
Weight of resected tissue (g)	-	25.20 \pm 15.16	
Recovery parameters			
Hemoglobin decrease 24h (g/dL)	-4.3 \pm 7.0	-13.8 \pm 11.0	0.001
Bladder catheter indwelling time (d)	1.3 \pm 1.4	3.3 \pm 1.4	0.001
Duration of hospital stay (d)	2.2 \pm 0.6	4.2 \pm 1.7	0.001
Adverse events during hospitalization			
Clavien Grade I	8 (16.7%)	5 (9.8%)	0.38
Clavien Grade II	0 (0%)	1 (2%) ^e	1.00
Clavien Grade IIIb	0 (0%)	1 (2%) ^f	1.00
Values are reported as means \pm SD or number (%); All differences in baseline characteristics between groups were nonsignificant; <i>p</i> -values for recovery variables are from two-sided t-tests and those for adverse events from Fisher's exact test.			
^a The Body mass index is the weight in kilograms divided by the square of the height in meters; ^b VAS: visual analogue scale for pain			
^c Paracetamol 1g was given before surgery			
^d Postoperative pain was not considered as a deviation from the normal postoperative course; therefore, it was not included in the total number of adverse events but assessed separately [13]			

Table 2. Cost breakdown for in-hospital costs arising from PAE and TURP.

Expense item	Mean costs per patient \pm SD (€)		P-value
	PAE (N=47) [*]	TURP (N=51)	
Surgical procedure (total)	4,240 \pm 774	3,617 \pm 1429	0.009
Physician professional charges	646 \pm 460	538 \pm 504	0.28
Operation facilities (technical staff, premises, equipment; PAE: imaging studies)	1,005 \pm 72	545 \pm 280	< 0.001
Medical supplies	2,590 \pm 628	717 \pm 367	< 0.001
Anaesthesia (anaesthesiology staff, medical supplies provided for anaesthesia, recovery room)	0	1,433 \pm 552	–
Pathology	0	359 \pm 273	–
Patient stay (total)	3,837 \pm 1,179	5,405 \pm 2,280	< 0.001
Physician professional charges	1,415 \pm 795	1,806 \pm 1,043	0.04
Services by nursing specialists	1,265 \pm 369	2,143 \pm 884	< 0.001
Medical supplies	68 \pm 10	120 \pm 59	< 0.001
Medication	275 \pm 39	147 \pm 62	< 0.001
Accommodation (including housekeeping and catering)	528 \pm 204	813 \pm 368	< 0.001
Laboratory services	288 \pm 130	375 \pm 168	0.005
Administrative costs	108 \pm 58	167 \pm 158	0.01
TOTAL IN-HOSPITAL COSTS	8,185 \pm 1,630	9,137 \pm 3,301	0.07

Costs are reported in euros and values reported are means \pm SD; p-values from two-sided t tests.
 Data from one patient who underwent PAE could not be provided by the accounts department.

